



John L. Salomone
Town Manager

TOWN OF NEWINGTON

131 CEDAR STREET
NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06111

MAYOR JEFF WRIGHT

MINUTES NEWINGTON TOWN COUNCIL December 8th 2009

Mayor Wright called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL

Councilors Present	
Councilor Christopher Banach	X
Councilor Tony Boni	X
Councilor Meg Casasanta	X
Councilor Myra Cohen	X
Councilor Maureen H. Klett	X
Councilor Mike Lenares	X
Councilor Scott P. McBride	X
Councilor Kristine Nasinnyk	X
Mayor Jeff Wright	X

Staff Present	
Town Manager - John Salomone	X
Executive Assistant - Jaime Trevethan	X
Council Clerk - Scott Coleman	X
Finance Director - Ann Harter	X
Town Planner - Ed Meehan	X
Highway Superintendent - Tom Malloy	X
Highway Asst. Super - Rob Hillman	X

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – IN GENERAL

Thomas Bowen

Resident

22 Woods Way

Newington

- Recommended that the Council set up a subcommittee regarding the 2020 Plan of Development to consider the issues which need to be addressed, then to set up a public hearing on the Plan
- Suggested that the Council proactively prepare for the outcome of State budget discussions.
- Asked the Council to consider requiring that Town Departments each make one percent cuts to their current budgets, which would remain in effect through the upcoming budget cycle. He stated that he felt this would force a serious evaluation of what was necessary and what was not, and would help trim the excess fat.

Maddie Kenny

Resident

53 Crestview Drive

Newington

- Hoped that her comments were not taken as obstructive criticism or abrasive

- Stated that she was impressed with the 2020 Plan of Development (POD). Within 38 pages she came up with 47 concerns, some due to wording, clarity and/or inability to understand. Wished that the Council and TPZ would take a closer look at the document. Wanted to assure that the Vision Statement mentioned in the document was actually fulfilled. Suggested the Council to consider Tom Bowen's recommendation to set up a subcommittee to thoroughly review the Plan in the light of public input. She stated that the beginning of the Plan talks about maintaining the Town as a New England town, but that the balance of the plan did not support this vision.

Rose Lyons Resident 46 Elton Drive Newington

- Agreed with the previous two speakers regarding the POD. She also had many questions.
- Town Council Rules of Procedure:
 - Mentioned the duplication of number 11. Section 10 is missing.
 - Asked the Council to consider extending the speaking time during public participation. Thought maybe the Council could make exceptions to the rules when the number of speakers is few rather than changing the rules.
 - Informed the Council that in the past Section 11 of the Rules had not been followed and that the Council had voted on New Business without a two-thirds vote and without public participation. She stated that she felt that the public should be able to comment on matters before the Council voted.

IV. CONSIDERATION OF OLD BUSINESS

A. Council Rules of Procedure (Tabled 11/24/09)

Mayor Wright mentioned a memo from the Town Manager, which detailed the only single suggestion which had come up during an agenda meeting with the Deputy Mayor and the Majority Leader. It concerned the three-minute rule on public participation.

Councilor Banach stated that the majority would like to increase the public speaking time from three to five minutes.

Councilor Nasinnyk brought up the phone line that the Board of Education uses for public participation which would permit the public to participate from home. She thought it was a good idea that the Council should consider, although it had not received much use by the Board.

Councilor Casasanta stated that she thought public participation was a good thing, and was not for or against the three or five minutes. She reminded the public that email addresses and phone numbers are listed on the Town web site, should the public wish to contact a member of the Council, as well as attending the Council meetings in person.

Town Manager Salomone mentioned that the duplicate section 11's would be changed in the updated Council Rules. Section #11, Public Participation, would become Section 10. He also mentioned that he was looking into unobtrusive, free computer software running on a laptop which would indicate speaking time remaining. He felt that it would be less harsh than the stoplight which had been used previously. It would allow the Mayor, as well as the speaker, to view the time countdown, and to take appropriate measures to end the participation. He suggested that the Council Clerk manage the system and that it would take the responsibility off the Mayor. He thought it would be helpful to the speaker to help them use their time more judiciously. He stated that the Council would not have to vote on it because it was already contained in the bylaws now. He thought the Council would like to try it at a future meeting, but that the Council did not have to be bound by it.

Mayor Wright asked **Councilor Cohen** how the timing of public participation was handled during her first eighteen years on the Council and whether the time had always been three minutes. She explained that it had not been timed previously, and that it was up to the Chair to decide when a speaker had spoken enough. The Mayor asked when the three minute rule had been added and the Councilor stated that there had been a major rules' revisions at least twice, but that she was unsure when. The Mayor requested that the Town Manager look into when the three-minute limit had been added or changed. **Councilor Cohen** stated that the rule had been implemented in response to abuse by a speaker. She read from the Rules of Procedure: "The chair, on approval by unanimous consent, may allow additional public participation." She stated that the decision could either be left up to the Chair, or Council to determine, by a unanimous or two-thirds vote, whether the item being presented was considered to be of a more relevant nature and the speaker were to be granted additional time. She commented that the Council was not married to the time limit and that it could be extended if the body so chose.

Councilor Boni stated that he was not sure what the difference was between three and four minutes and suggested that the Council consider four minutes as a compromise. He expressed a concern about using the telephone, stating that it might become a special interest way to bombard the Council with phone calls, tying the Council up all night, and that there was no way to determine from where the calls originate or their source. He suggested that if the public could not appear in person, that they could use one of the alternatives, email or phone, to contact the Town Manager or Council.

Councilor Klett commented that the Board of Ed had a phone line since she could remember, but that it had only received one call. She stated that it was not a regularly used method of communication by the public. **Councilor Boni** responded that the Council and Board of Ed were two different bodies. He stated that the Council's public turnout was generally greater than that of the Board of Ed, and that he did not feel that the Board's agenda items affected "so many people" as those of the Council. **Councilor Nasinnyk** responded that she would be much appreciative if the people were interested enough to flood the phone line with comments. She felt that it had not yet been tried by the Council, and that with bad weather, it was just another avenue to make available for the public participation. If the Council would have to remain until 2 in the morning, and it's not going to work, then the public would be forced to speak in person. She stated that the Board of Ed meets in the same room and posts the phone number for callers. She advocated for giving it a try to see if it works.

Councilor Casasanta added that the Council and Board both do the work of the people and that, if they are exhausted, they will lose their perspective and will be unable to continue to do that work. She noted that while public participation is important, it has to be realized what the role of the body is, what they are elected to do, and that they have to have the time to get the work done.

Councilor Banach inquired of **Town Manager Salomone** whether changes in the Council's Rules of Procedure could be made anytime during the Council's duration. **Town Manager Salomone** responded, yes, absolutely, that there was no restriction of doing it only once every two years. **Councilor Banach** stated that in his opinion it was worth trying. **Mayor Wright** read from the Rules, Section 2: "...these rules may be amended or suspended by a majority vote of the full Council."

Councilor Cohen responded to **Councilor Boni** stating that in the past the public had attended the meetings in groups of twenty or thirty people, overloading the Council chambers, and that if they wanted to bombard the Council, they could do so in person as well as on the phone. She noted that if bombarding the Council was going to be a problem, it is not because phones are being used but "because the public wanted to *do* something".

Town Manager Salomone stated that he is not worried about people sabotaging a meeting, that it would be pretty obvious if it happened. He noted that when the public appears in person, they state their name and address for the record. It is his concern is that there exists a potential for phone callers to incorrectly identify themselves. When a person identifies themselves before the Council, you pretty much know they are who they say they are. He mentioned the use of caller ID to screen callers. He stated that he agreed with Councilor Klett that phone call-ins were not being used that much by the Board of Ed. He commented that the Town gives the public many ways to communicate, but he is old-fashioned in the sense that he believes that if people were really interested, they could be participatory and attend the meeting. He noted that his conservative nature leads him to have concerns over the public making contact anonymously over the phone. **Deputy Mayor Lenares** mentioned that he shares these concerns about caller identification. He reiterated that during his eight years on the Board of Ed, the Board had only received one call under public participation. He asked **Councilor Casasanta** how many calls she had received during her time on the Board of Ed. She stated that over her two year term the Board had averaged four or five calls. **Deputy Mayor Lenares** noted that his preference was public participation in person. He also noted that he has no problem in extending the speaker time limit from three to five minutes, and that in the past the Council has been lenient concerning time limits when few members of the public are in attendance. He inquired of the **Town Manager** whether he was aware whether the Board's phone-in system made caller-id available, and whether callers could block their numbers. Town Manager Salomone stated that he didn't wish to get into the technicalities, but mentioned his concern is that when the public speaks anonymously, that they might be less restrictive about what they might say, and that it was harder to gavel them out of order by phone. Another Councilor commented that one could hang up, but the Town Manager thought this approach might be a bit abrupt. He stated that he didn't have problems with it, but just technically they would have to figure it out.

Councilor Banach asked Manager Salomone whether a policy might be instituted not to accept blocked calls. The Town Manager responded that before they implement the concept, they ought to consider what procedures should be put in place, as he felt hanging up on someone was kind of abrupt. He was concerned that things can get out of control, and that they should put safeguards in place, if the majority decides this is the way they want to go.

Councilor Casasanta explained the callers into the Board of Ed are asked to provide their name and address in the case of an anonymous call.

Councilor McBride stated that he feels that anything which draws the public more into the process, is going to be beneficial for everybody. He didn't feel that there was any harm in giving the phone call-ins a shot, but expressed concerns, not just about anonymous calls, but with callers misrepresenting who they are. He made the point that he was not aware of the availability of Board phone-ins, and wondered about how many others, maybe new to the town, were also unaware of this option.

Councilor Klett stated that she did not have a problem with increasing the means of public participation. She noted that there is no liability on their part if a member of the public were to call in and misrepresent themselves. She wanted to make sure that it was just something that happened, not something that could come back to haunt them. **Town Manager Salomone** expressed concern about a prankster yelling obscenities, and that he would like to take a look at it from that standpoint and see if there is any FOI type of requirement, or similar things. He said that he would get back to the Council prior to the next Council meeting. He asked the Council whether they wanted to consider the phone-ins as part of the amendment to the Council Rules of Procedure. **Councilor Banach** answered, yes. Town Manager Salomone said that he would put his findings into a Council memorandum.

Mayor Wright expressed his concerns in expanding the time for public participation from three to five minutes. He stated that public attendees and speakers at Council meetings are usually few, but that some meetings do draw a lot of public participation. With a proposed two-thirds increase in the time limit, he was concerned with the input taking too long, and the meetings running too late. He pointed out section twelve of the rules which states that "No consideration of any agenda item which may include a vote being taken, shall commence after 10:30, except public participation and adjournment. This rule may be waived by a 2/3 vote prior to 10:30." He commented that it's the Council's objective to have meetings completed by 11:00. He stated that it is his concern that during their busiest times they are going to be required to conduct a very, very long meeting, and not be able to get the required business completed. He is interested in seeing how long the three minute rule has been in effect and has it been changed. He stated that, at first glance, he was not in favor of extending the time from three to five minutes. He mentioned that he believes the Council needs to hear from the public, but that at the same time the Council needs to do the business of the people.

Councilor Cohen noted that because everyone has five minutes, that not everyone will speak for five minutes. **Mayor Wright** responded that over the past two years in which he's been involved, his observation is that the majority of the people who spoke, spoke right up to their time limit.

Councilor Nasinnyk noted that most of the time the Council has been able to conduct the Town's business in a timely manner. She pointed out that the Council was elected to serve the people and that the Council should be cognizant of it. If meetings are running late, she stated that the Mayor, as the Chair, has the right to adjust the rules to compensate. **Mayor Wright** responded that, under the rules, as he reads them, he would not have the right to shorten the five minute speaking time, only to extend it. **Councilor Nasinnyk** noted that it would be nice to have the public turn out in such throngs that it would be necessary to have to curtail their time.

Councilor Klett offered a compromise of four minutes and that if it's not working, according to Town Manager Salomone, the rules could be reopened at that time. She suggested starting with four minutes and reevaluating it in the future. She stated that she is one who believes that if you give five minutes, speakers will "encroach" on four and a half minutes. **Councilor Boni** agreed with Councilor Klett, noting that from four to five minutes was quite an increase. He stated that he would be in favor of four minutes, but not five.

Mayor Wright noted that the Council did not have to vote on the amendment to the Rules that night. He stated that he did like the [four minute] suggestion and asked if the piece of business would be on the next meeting's agenda. The response was affirmative.

B. Continuation of Council Review and Discussion: 2010 – 2020 Draft Plan of Conservation and Development

Mayor Wright invited Ed Meehan, Town Planner and Cathy Hall, TPZ Chair to the Council table to discuss the 2020 POD. He asked the Town Planner how he wished to proceed. Mr. Meehan stated that TPZ's plan of action is to continue the public hearing on the draft plan through minimally, March, or longer if needed, to obtain as much public and Council input as possible. He commented that the public turnout was great. He stated that this is the TPZ's second draft, and that they are ready to work with the Council to see what they want to see in the long range plan. He noted that they are not creating regulations with legal language, but a vision to carry the town forward and guide them through the next ten years. He gave alternatives that the Council could structure it as a

subcommittee, or the Council as a whole; whatever the Council sees fit. The TPZ is there to help the process move forward.

Councilor Banach inquired as to how the Council was to intersect with the TPZ and the plan. For example, how would the Council act on certain items in which they were not in favor? **Mr. Meehan** responded that as the statute reads, the Council, as the legislative body, under the relatively new process, would report collective edits, modifications, or additions back to the TPZ. Upon receiving the Council's report, TPZ could vote it up or down by a 2/3 vote. As an example, if the Council expressed that they disagreed with consolidation of the Parks and Rec and Highway Facilities garages, but TPZ thought it was an efficient way to do business, by a 2/3 vote they could overrule it. He suggested a more flexible approach might be to form a subcommittee of the Council. Eventually, he said, it would have to take the form of a vote by the Council to add change, or modify the plan. **Councilor Banach** asked what form the document would take. **Mr. Meehan** stated that it could be in any form the Council wished, and that it would be a creative writing process over the next six weeks or two months. **Councilor Banach** asked how technical the Council needed to be. The Town Planner responded that it was up to the Council, and that there were no limits on how the legislative body participates.

Councilor Klett stated that there is a state statute that the POD is supposed to be transmitted to the Council 65 days before the public hearing, and that she is aware that the past Council has had the current draft since July. She asked about her understanding that the Council has, as its option, to take a position, but is not required to do so, that the Town Planner is in attendance for informational purposes, and that it doesn't change that a simple majority is required to pass the POD when the public hearing closes. She further inquired about the process, giving an example about higher density housing mentioned in the vision statement, and asked whether if the Council chose to not endorse a portion of the vision statement, a 2/3 vote of TPZ would be required to override the Council in order to include it. **Town Planner Meehan** responded that this was his understanding. He suggested that input from the Council, which called out or highlighted those major vision statements and strategies, by paragraph and page number, which the Council doesn't wish included in the plan, and if they would provide substitute language, it would help guide the TPZ as they redraft the POD. He further stated that the TPZ would like to work on the plan during the public hearing, incorporating all feedback at that time, rather than closing the hearing and then assimilating all input. He reiterated that things which the Council believes should not appear in the POD, should be reported back to TPZ., so that the TPZ knows where its chief elected officials are coming from.

Councilor Klett commented that she was glad that this was made clear this time around as she did not believe that it had not been explained the last time. She also asked from where the high density and medium density discussion in the plan's vision statement had originated, and who made the decision to include this direction as she felt it had the potential to change the character of the community. She wanted to know how the 2005 and current plan came to be so different. TPZ Chair, Cathy Hall responded that when the previous plan had been put together, there was no such thing as transit-oriented design. She explained that this is a fairly new concept, but that in creating a ten-year plan, future concepts have to be incorporated, although they may not be in existence when the plan is being drafted. She further explained that the POD is not a blueprint which is to be followed from A to Z. But, rather it is a document which the TPZ is trying to have cover any eventuality which may occur in the next ten years. She stated that the TPZ does not have a crystal ball, and that they have done their best to forecast the upcoming trends. She commented that the concept of transit-oriented design, at the state level, is major. This concept had been included in the plan to take into account future development in this area. As an example, she explained that the Bus-way Plan, which has been included, may implode and the Council may not endorse it. Because it's been included in the plan doesn't mean it necessarily has to happen. The Zoning Regulations, supersede anything appearing in the POD.

Council Klett gave an example referencing content in the plan and again reiterated her question concerning who made decisions to make the changes mentioned in the plan, which differ from the last POD. The Town Planner stated that the specific question would not be discussed during this meeting, but would be dealt with when the Council directs by committee or as a whole. He responded, using the Kitts Lane property, mentioned by Councilor Klett, as an example, stating that the plan is a collection and evolution of many studies which have occurred during the last ten years, including the Transportation Accessibility Study, the Bus-way Studies, the very beginning studies of the New Haven-Hartford-Springfield Line, as well as the studies conducted by TPZ after the last plan was adopted for the town center guidelines. **Mr. Meehan** stated that he wished to leave a message with the Council that the Plan is not done, that it is an iterative process and that the specific issues and concerns deserve to be discussed in open session and revised as appropriate. The goal is to create a plan that the land-use body, officially designated by the Council can endorse, and which can be used to guide capital improvements, possibly zoning changes, as well as open space grant, and economic development applications. He stated that it was his job to help the Council reach that point.

Councilor Cohen inquired about the POD development process, asking whether the approach was not to have the Council review the entire POD and come up with a final report, but rather that the Council would, section-by-section, take their comments to the TPZ for inclusion in the ongoing public hearing process. **Mayor Wright** asked the Councilor whether it was her understanding that the Council was to review the POD content piecemeal, by section, the order prioritized by the Council, then to submit Council comments to the TPZ as each section is completed. The Mayor asked the Town Planner and TPZ chair whether there was a scheduled planned out of which sections would be approached first. The TPZ chair responded that TPZ is taking its cues from the public, as well as the Council, and has left the process open from meeting to meeting. She stated that it would make no sense to close the hearings until such time as the TPZ had received Council input. She responded to **Councilor Cohen's** question that if the Council would provide comments on a section-by-section basis, that the TPZ would have something to build on. She suggested that the subcommittee approach, in which the body conducted extra meetings and brought information and input back to the entire Council for review, might be an efficient way to handle the process. She warned the Council about the July 1st deadline, mentioning the funding issue, and reiterated her suggestion that the work be conducted in pieces, by section. She commented that there are probably some sections of the report which might require more changes than others. She also suggested that the Council possibly consider areas of greater concern first, working its way backward to areas with less concerns. The TPZ has taken at least a tentative step to keep the public hearings open until at least March 1st for taking public and Council input.

Mayor Wright asked of the Town Planner whether grant money had been received for development of the POD. Town Planner Meehan confirmed that the Town had received a \$20,000 grant to facilitate developing and printing of the plan. He said that he would be reporting to OPM at the end of the fiscal of the year on the status. He followed up on a question posed by **Councilor Klett**, stating that the statutes give the Town Council the right to conduct its own public hearing on the POD. He thought that this might be an efficient way to handle the Council's plan input, and offered to assist the Council in the process. **Mayor Wright** inquired of Mr. Meehan whether the Council was in danger of losing any of the grant. Town Planner Meehan stated that the contract was signed last June or July, and that the money had already been drawn down.

Councilor Klett stated that she would not be in favor of subcommittee as she felt the issue was too important and all officials around the Council table were elected, and all nine should have the obligation to understand the plan and submit their comments. As far as a public hearing, she commented that she felt the TPZ had that handled pretty well. The TPZ was leaving the hearings at least open until March and she feels that it's probably the better venue in which to hold those hearings.

Councilor Klett asked Town Planner Meehan about a comment he made earlier concerning page 34 of the POD, site #20. She noted that the tape of the October 13th Council meeting identified that Kitts Lane offers transit-oriented opportunities. **Mayor Wright** asked the Councilor to what she was referring. She stated that it was page 34, #17 and read "establish incentive housing zones special exception criteria for the inclusion of at least 20% affordable units within multi-unit development adjacent to the Berlin Tpke. And within transit development areas pursuant to the cgs section 8-13." The document identifies four sites, one of which is number 20. This is the site which backs up to those homes on Kitts Lane. She further stated that this area offers a great opportunity transit-oriented development. She asked Town Planner Meehan to explain "special exception criteria". Town Planner Meehan explained that they needed to sit together and walk themselves through the some of the language and see where sections of the plan cross over and refer to other sections. For example, he continued, the property on Kitts Lane is identified as an opportunity site for medium density housing, but not as a transit-oriented site. He explained that transit-oriented means bus-ways, or rail. He referred the Councilor to review page 48 which stated that the strategy is to request the Connecticut Transit Service to consider bus service looping their bus to the Kitts Lane neighborhood, because this is the area where the majority of condos and multi-family houses are located, parallel to the Berlin Tpke. He noted that this is not a new recommendation and that it appeared in the 1995 POD, and that Connecticut Transit has failed to accomplish this as yet. He stated that while they would like to increase public transit use, that Connecticut Transit is not bringing the busses to the neighborhoods in Newington which might offer the best opportunities for transit. He suggested he sit with the Councilor to walk each other through the POD and clarify vague areas of the plan.

Councilor Banach wished to reference page 5 of the 1995 POD which states that "our population density of over 2000 persons per square mile is the fourth highest in the Capitol Region". He asked that if this is true, then why would the Town entertain a suggestion made by the state to include high density housing. Specifically, he mentioned the Cashway area in which it owns or has purchased several properties. He mentioned that he had attended several meetings three or four years ago, and that he was quite disappointed with their public presentation and the fact that the DOT could not answer the question of what amount of acreage they owned around the Cashway property. He also stated that the DOT assured them at those meetings that anything that built there was under local control. He stated that he was getting mixed messages and that if a bus-way station is

planned, and high density is built near the bus-way, who controls the property; whether they make a bus stop or not, who controls the issue whether high density gets built or not. Town Planner Meehan responded that the TPZ does, by their legislative power to make zoning changes. **Councilor Banach** then asked whether the Town then has absolute control over the area. **Town Planner Meehan** confirmed this and elaborated that the only property over which the state has control are the two or three parcels they bought recently around Newington Junction. He noted that the land use power of changing to Smart Growth, transit-oriented development, increasing the density to 15-20 units per acres or leaving it as it is now is purely, at this point in time, in Connecticut, is a local land-use policy decision. He further explained that if the Council does not wish to buy into certain strategies, the TPZ needs to be made aware and they would not belong in the POD. **Councilor Banach** asked then whether the DOT, on the parcels they own, whether they would have the authority to build what they wished. TPZ Chair, **Cathy Hall** commented that the DOT would not own the property, only the right of way, and that they would not be able to tell the Town what it has to do there. The DOT may own the right of way, but it's up to the Town to decide what it wants to do with the property.

Councilor Banach asked about the property which the DOT purchased from businesses and whether the businesses which relocated have been removed from the tax rolls. Town Planner Meehan answered that they were off the tax rolls.

Mayor Wright added on the topic of transit-oriented development that the Town has two sites, the corner of Cedar and Fenn and also Newington junction (the Cashway-West Hill area) which he views as two opportunities with question marks around the projects. The proposed bus-way will extend from the City of New Britain into Hartford with two stops, Cedar and Fenn and the Newington Junction. The commuter rail from New Haven to Springfield line would also have a stop, if it were to go forward, at the Newington Junction location. He commented that he believes if it were to happen, it would be a good opportunity for the Town to take advantage of. He mentioned that significant development was approved a year and a half ago around the Cedar-Fenn bus-way location including a hotel and retail. This is directly across from a large plot of property owned by Connecticut State University (108 acres) on the south side of Cedar along Route 9. He stated that the future plans are for an east campus of CCSU. He posited that the area could become some sort of high density student housing development. Being privately owned, it would become part of the tax rolls, and would be a good match for the location and the community. He stated that while he has apprehensions about high density housing himself, if properly done, it could be a very positive thing for the community. He stated that he feels that if the decision, while out of their control, does go forward, then everything should be done in their power to make the most out of it for their community. He pointed to the Boston area, as an example, citing the T-Stops, and the positive economic development which has arisen in their immediate proximity.

Councilor Cohen cautioned that while the original goal of transit-oriented development was to reduce the amount of traffic, in fact, the new high density development might actually end up contributing to it. **Mayor Wright** commented that if the State is going to create the transit stops, then it should be up to the Town to figure out how to make it work to their advantage to get the most out of it.

Councilor Klett commented that she believes that the Council has an obligation to make sure that the people of the Town aware of what is going on. She stated that, concerning the plan the residents do not know. She restated that she feels that the Town needs to find a better way to communicate with the public. There are several studies which the Councilor has asked the **Town Manager** to make available to the Council, one of which is the Traffic Circulation Accessibility Study, also a Station Area Planning Study, which looked at conceptual design for half-a-mile radius around the proposed bus-way, along with a bus-way design and engineer study which looked at the 9.4 mile transit plan and the twelve stations. Also mentioned was an executive summary which shows the large tracts of conceptual development. She thought the studies might give the Council a better idea what is being planned by CRCOG. She commented that if the plans remain as they are, that it would be a green-light for CRCOG. She stated that this might not be the same thing that the people of Newington wanted.

Councilor Klett asked Town Planner Meehan whether the information placed at the TPZ member's table at one of the public hearings, which talks about Cedar Mountain and identifies six possible strategies and long-range future land-use considerations, is being considered for inclusion in the POD. She asked for an explanation of the rationale for doing so. **Town Planner Meehan** responded that he is responsible for writing the document which is comprised of drafting suggestions made with the intent of sharing it with TPZ. It was created in an effort to provide additional strategies to protect the ridgeline mountain area. It was Town Planner Meehan's plan to provide drafts like this one for all areas of the plan in order to facilitate TPZ discussions. Councilor Klett inquired whether the intent was to add these strategies into the plan. **Town Planner Meehan** responded that this would be up to TPZ and that they were talking points to initiate the thought process and stimulate discussion.

TPZ Chair Cathy Hall added that with the public hearing remaining open, that the TPZ has not had an opportunity to discuss the POD among themselves. Once the hearings are closed, then the TPZ will have a chance to evaluate input and deliberate among themselves. **Councilor Klett** commented that the situation unfortunately placed the TPZ in the spotlight for being possibly supporters of the document when they actually didn't have anything to do with it. Chair Hall stated that none of the TPZ is in favor or opposed to the POD as yet; as they are just gathering information at this point.

Councilor Casasanta wanted to make sure that the public knows that TPZ regulations supersede the POD and that it is merely a guide for the next ten years. Chair Hall corroborated this point.

Councilor Nasinnyk commented that the first time TPZ appeared before the Council with the draft POD, that the Council was unsure of their role in the process, as it was new by statute and that they had not received the transmittal letter from TPZ. She stated that the Council is now taking more of an active role because they now know that it is expected. She stated that she is impressed to hear about the current status and direction of the plan; that the TPZ is expecting Council input and that they will keep the public hearings open. She thanked the TPZ for their efforts.

Mayor Wright thanked Chairman Hall, and commented that the Council would have decide how they wished to proceed, either through a committee format, or at the Council level, by taking on a section at a time.

C. Discussion: Create Open Space Committee

Councilor Banach stated that he thought the formation of this committee was a good idea in order to take a hard look at what open space remains, how could desirable property, deemed to be valuable, be saved. He asked the Town Manager for a review of how the committee would be formed, its charges, and its duration, and specifics on the money issues. **Mayor Wright** asked the Councilor to clarify what he meant by "money issues". **Councilor Banach** explained that he was looking for information on what the committee could do in terms of obtaining funds; could they pursue grants, or was this solely a Council prerogative?

Mayor Wright suggested that Town Manager Salomone start by responding to Councilor Banach's question concerning money issues. **Town Manager Salomone** proceeded, referencing section IV, entitled "Determining Committee Work Schedule and Reporting timeline", of his December 2nd Open Space Committee memo.

- IV.a. Short-term time lines (Jan through Mar). He stated that if the Council was looking for fiscal 2010-11 budgetary funding, this would have to be resolved in that time period.
- IV.b. Medium time lines: Referendum funding is also a possibility, rather than pay-as-you-go. The Council would have to follow the time line related to the timing of specific referendum, whether or not it coincides with an election.
- IV.c. Long-term funding opportunities including state, federal, private and public sector grants. Sometimes quasi-public grants for open space acquisition, depending upon the uniqueness of the property, are available from agencies such as the Audubon Society depending. These grants take time depending on the opportunities. Federal grants can take significant time. Town Manager Salomone related a past experience in Auburn New York during which he sought a multi-million dollar, Federal, National Park Service, historic property grant for Harriet Tubman property, and it became a ten year process. He stated that the process could require from three months to whenever depending on the grant request.
- He reminded the Council that another alternative exists of using money from a reserve fund which would be set aside by ordinance for the purpose of open space purchase. This ordinance already exists.

He stated that there could be a mix of funds available from the General Fund, as well as Capital Budget items for property acquisition (as soon as the Capital Improvement subcommittee is reformulated).

Councilor Banach asked about the composition of the subcommittee. He commented that the Town Manager's memo had suggested members from TPZ, Conservation and Economic Development. He asked if it might also include two Council members and maybe four members from the public for a nine member committee. **Town Manager Salomone** responded that he did not provide a number and that he was very careful to use a blank in he memo. He cautioned that the Council might want to have a plurality of "something" to provide a bit more direction. As an example he said that the Council might want to have three Council members and then not any one group with a dominant number of people so that there would be consensus-building. He also cautioned from making the committee too large as it becomes too cumbersome to obtain consensus. **Councilor Banach** asked ho often a committee like this might meet. **Town Manager Salomone** responded that it might be tied to the timelines, and that there was nothing that said this committee could not become a permanent adjunct committee to the council. He suggested that, maybe in the future, the committee might report funding opportunities to the CIP committee. He offered that this committee might want to organize quickly in order to provide budgetary input for the upcoming year.

Mayor Wright asked Town Manager Salomone to clarify for him whether the committee would ultimately bring back to the Council recommendations, and all actions would be taken by the Council. Town Manager Salomone answered that actions regarding grants should come back to the Town Council at the ultimate fiscal authority and legislative body. He further stated that this didn't mean that the committee could not go out and conduct research on what type of grant are available, but that it would take the legislative authority of the Council to make application.

Councilor Nasinnyk commented that she like the idea of a nine person committee because of the expertise which might be required from standing committees such as the TPZ, EDC and Conservation Committee, plus the Council, as well as the public. She added that it had been established many years ago that the Council was to be made aware of all grants which were being applied for. .

D. Town Council Proposed Meeting Schedule – 2010

MOVED by: Councilor Lanares .

RESOLVED:

The Newington Town Council, in compliance with the Freedom of Information act, hereby approves the 2010 Town Council regular meeting schedule as indicated on the attached document

SECONDED by: Councilor Banach.

VOTE: Motion passes 9 – 0; Unanimous

E. Revised Job Description: Dial-A-Ride Transportation Driver (LT-7)

MOVED by: Councilor Lanares .

RESOLVED:

The Newington Town Council hereby approves of amendments to the “Classification and Pay Plan” by approving revised job/position description for the Dial-A-Ride Transportation Driver (LT-7) as recommended by the Town Manager in his capacity as Personnel Director in his memorandum dated November 20, 2009.

SECONDED by: Councilor Nasinnyk

VOTE: Motion passes 9 – 0; Unanimous

V. CONSIDERATION OF NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion: Sanitation/Recycling Collection Contracts (Tabled 11/24/09)

Mayor Wright invited Town staff, including Ann Harter, Town Finance Director, Tom Malloy, Town Highway Superintendent, and Rob Hillman, Town Highway, Assistant Superintendent, to the Council table. **Mayor Wright** stated that the discussion would concern hauling contracts for trash collection and recycling. The discussion was precipitated due to the June 30th expiration of the Town's current contracts.

Town Manager Salomone stated that some decision points were coming up, and that the staff needed direction from the Council. He explained that the options are outlined in his memo of November 20th, entitled “Sanitation/Recycling Collection Contracts”. He reviewed these options with the Council.

Item #1: Collection of municipal and solid waste from residential homes:

- The recommendation is to continue with the current contractor extended bearing an annual increase of 3%. **Town Manager Salomone** stated that felt that this was a good deal for the town.

Discussion:

Councilor Cohen asked if the Town extended the contract, whether the Town would, in actuality, be paying out [to the vendor], the difference between the \$330,000 and the \$110,000 for the collection containers over

the extension period. **Town Manager Salomone** said that this was true, but that the payment was included in the fee that's fixed. He added that the cost is being amortized over the additional years of the new contract.

Councilor Casasanta asked if there was an option to renegotiate. **Highway Superintendent Malloy** stated that what is being presented is the renegotiation. **Mayor Wright** asked if there were an opportunity to ask for a reduction off the 3%. **Highway Superintendent Malloy** stated that this had already been done. He stated that this is the bottom line at which the vendor would be willing to extend the contract. It's not negotiable from here, he remarked.

Councilor Nasinnyk asked if this would be done in the same way as recyclables are being handled. She asked if this were single stream. **Mayor Wright** and **Town Manager Salomone** stated that this pertains to just solid waste, not recyclables. **Mayor Wright** explained that these are just the green barrels at single family homes (not condominiums) used for garbage. **Councilor Nasinnyk** inquired as to how many other companies offered these services. **Highway Superintendent Malloy** responded that there are probably four or five in the region.

Mayor Wright stated that under the terms of this contract that his instincts are to stick with it. **Highway Superintendent Malloy** agreed.

Councilor Cohen asked for clarification on the 3% increase. 3% of what she asked. **Highway Superintendent Malloy** answered that it is the increase over what is currently being paid. In dollars, she inquired. **Highway Superintendent Malloy** stated that the current rate is \$81.36. The increase would bring that rate to \$83.80. **Mayor Wright** said that this would be a total increase of \$22,400.

Item #2: Collection of municipal and solid waste from condominiums. **Highway Superintendent Malloy** explained:

- The Town is currently on the last year of a four year contract which expires at the end of June.
- The Town has been paying \$36 per dwelling unit, which equals almost 90,000/year for collection.

Discussion:

Highway Superintendent Malloy stated that the cost had increased \$1/year per dwelling over the four years of the contract. He stated that he had made contact with the contractor, asking if he was interested in extending the contract (there is a two year extension clause in the contract). The initial proposal was for a 17% increase. After negotiation, the best offer was an 11% increase, or \$4/dwelling unit. **Highway Superintendent Malloy's** recommendation is put it out to bid.

Mayor Wright asked the Town's Highway Superintendent about the disparity between the 3% increase quoted by the other vendor contracted for single family homes. Mr. Malloy stated that he did not know, but that he could go back and see what the vendor would do. **Town Manager Salomone** stated that he thought that the 11% was the bottom line, but that he could go back and ask for a reduced price based on the 3% negotiated for single family home waste hauling.

Deputy Mayor Lenares asked Highway Superintendent Malloy whether the rate had been reduced from 17%, to which he responded, yes. His feeling was that the contractor prices the service at what he felt the market would bear.

Councilor Banach asked how many companies were available to perform this service. Mr. Malloy answered that this is a smaller job and that other companies have automated trucks. He stated that there are at least three or four companies, if not more, available to bid.

Councilor Cohen asked why the differential between single family residential and condominium pricing; \$83 vs. \$40 per unit. **Mayor Wright** explained that the difference was due to the amount of labor required. Condo owners dump into larger dumpsters, rather than individual units home-by-home.

Mayor Wright emphasized that the yearly costs mentioned only includes the collection costs, not the tonnage the Town is dumping.

Item #3: Collection of recyclables.

Mayor Wright explained that this topic came under discussion about a year ago when CRRA changed their recycling process to single-stream recycling, which the Mayor explained allows all recyclables to be deposited in a single container. The current blue recycling bins are 14 gallons. The Town pays for one bin per household. He explained that from his research and discussions that other communities are switching to 95

gallon recycle bins which hold more. The goal is to increase the amount of recycling, because every ton which is recycled is one less ton for which the Town has to pay disposal costs. He explained that the Town is currently disposing of about 10,000 tons of garbage a year while only recycling about 2,000 tons. About 84% of everything taken to the curb is garbage, 16% is recycled. In San Francisco, 35% is garbage and 65% is being recycled. His thoughts are that if the Town were to use a 90 gallon container (the cost differential between 65 and 90 gallon bins is about \$5 on a price of \$60 for the smaller capacity), and the Town reaches a recycling ratio of 60% garbage, the savings would eat up the up front container costs.

Town Manager Salomone explained the current recycling situation:

- He asked whether the Town wanted to continue with its current vendor, CWPM for recycling, who has offered to continue for an additional two years at \$27.50/dwelling with no increase.
- The public needs to be better educated about the single-stream recycling (everything to be recycled is placed in one container) process
- A proposal is on the table for single-stream recycling at \$43.33/dwelling. The cost differential is that the contractor would be responsible for the cost of the collection bins plus the costs associated with automation of the collection process.
- The total cost would be about \$180,000 over the current cost.
- A single-stream alternative would be for the town to purchase the recycling bins. The cost would be \$35/dwelling.
- Director Harter provided a chart delineating the recycling options. **Town Manager Salomone** explained the chart. Another option for dual fourteen gallon bins was included, under the theory that more space would yield greater recycling which would reduce waste tonnage thus saving the Town costs.

Discussion:

Mayor Wright inquired about the \$70/ton CRRA figure being used in the calculations. He asked whether only a \$1 increase was being anticipated. Director Harter responded that the \$70 figure was an estimate which included a \$6/ton rebate which is being applied for next year. The Mayor asked whether that had been done for this year. Director Harter responded, no, that the money was being saved for the following year. The Mayor asked whether or not it had been decided six months ago to take it this year. **Town Manager Salomone** stated that the commitment had already been made before they did "that". He said that the money had been reserved for next year and that it would help. **Mayor Wright** continued the discussion with the Director over what number should be used to calculate the tonnage rate. The Mayor advocated that a higher number of around \$80/ton should be used during the second year, excluding the \$6 rebate. **Town Manager Salomone** explained that, wanting to be on the conservative side, they had used a lower number to calculate the cost-benefit. Town Manager Salomone stated that he felt the key number to focus on is the projected 500 ton savings due to a reduction in waste.

Councilor Banach inquired about the \$70 figure being used to calculate the CRRA tonnage cost. Director Harter responded, explaining that the 2010-2011 rate was anticipated to be \$76 less a one time \$6/ton rebate, but that it could be as high as \$10/ton. No one knows.

Mayor Wright stated that he felt that if the commitment is made to increase the recycling by changing the containers, then the town would have to reach out to the citizens with. The Mayor related that in his conversations with a lot of people in town there is much frustration with the Town's recycling. He said that he even knew people who threw cardboard away, just because they don't want to cut it up into the perfectly shaped pieces required. **Town Manager Salomone** agreed. The Mayor compared West Hartford to Newington stating that they were already 50% ahead of Newington. The Mayor feels that that if the Town was to make a push, that it could reach a thousand tons which is only a 50% increase. He sees even greater strides. The Mayor calculated out five years stating that if the Town were to consider financing the bins, then the cost after five years would be approximately what it is today without the bins, assuming a modest increase.

The **Mayor** asked the Highway Superintendent how the bins were holding up, and he responded that after five years they are doing well and that he felt they could expect to get ten years of life. He asked the Finance Director if the finance costs could be drawn out longer. **Director Harter** explained that the town would then have to pay the added interest costs. She suggested 3 to 5 years financing. The **Mayor** asked about the opportunity today due to the low interest rate. The **Director** responded that the Town's rate is now 3.25 to 3.5% for a lease-purchase option. She stated that she projected that it would take about 7 years to recoup the initial cost of the investment in the recycling barrels. **Town Manager Salomone** stated that he thought that the lease-purchase arrangement would be a better option than paying the vendor for the containers. He explained, however, that if the Town purchased the bins, it would be responsible for their maintenance,

whereas now that's left to the hauler. The **Highway Superintendent** added that with fewer pickups, there would be less maintenance and that the recycle bins would last 12 to 15 years on a biweekly schedule.

Councilor Cohen added that she doubted the success of the dual 14 gallon recycling bin approach, stating that she doubted very much that her husband would want to walk up and down the driveway twice. The **Mayor** inquired whether a 65 gal bin would be made available, as well, for single households.

Councilor Nasinnyk stated that she is in favor of single-stream recycling, anything to make it easier for people to recycle. It's better for the ecology, better the town and the environment. She expressed her concern about public confusion over what can and can't be recycled because things keep changing. She commented that the people of Newington are fortunate as in some rural towns the residents have to bring the refuse to the dump, and it can cost per bag of trash. She believes that recycling is the way to go.

Councilor McBride stated that he feels the main variable to making the programs work is the education. Getting people to recycle more is not just about putting a bigger barrel in front of their house, it's about educating them as to what is recyclable.

Deputy Mayor Lenares suggested that if the Town were to take this route, then they use Channel 14 to get the message out and to educate the public.

Town Manager Salomone asked the Highway Superintendent about the timing. He responded stating that the contracts expire at the end of the June. The Manager added that the bins would be purchased in the next fiscal year and this would have to be incorporated into the upcoming budget requests. He stated that he believed that the Town was interested in the single-stream recycling program, but it was yet to be determined which avenue they would pursue. **Mayor Wright** commented that he did not believe that there was much excitement about dual 14 gallon container option. **Deputy Mayor Lenares** expressed his opinion was to hold off on the 14 gals approach.

Mayor Wright asked about the lead time. The **Highway Superintendent** told him that the order lead time would be about a month and a half and it would take at least a month to get the bid out and awarded. The Mayor stated that he felt there was consensus on the waste management approach and. directed the Town Manager to prepare three motions for the next meeting.

B. 2010 Goal Setting Session Schedule

The Mayor stated that he would prefer to get this meeting up and running sooner rather than later. He asked for consensus on the January 14th date at Town Hall. **Councilor Klett** asked about having the meeting on a Saturday when they would be fresh. The Mayor stated that, due to family, Saturdays were personally difficult. **Councilor Banach** asked about splitting the meeting into 2 two-hour sessions. The consensus appeared to favor one four hour session on January 14th. **Town Manager Salomone** committed to using a facilitator.

C. Consolidation of Newington High School Project Building Committees

Mayor Wright, referring to a memo from Jeff Baron and the Town Manager, asked the Council whether there were any concerns about rolling the High School gym floor replacement project committee into the High School code compliance project committee. No one voiced concerns.

VI. RESIGNATIONS/APPOINTMENTS

A. Resignation: Human Rights Commission

1. Accept Resignation of Monica Golec

MOVED by: Councilor Lanares .

RESOLVED:

That the Newington Town Council hereby accepts the resignation of Monica Golec from the Human Rights Commission in accordance with correspondence to the Town Clerk dated December 1, 2009.

SECONDED by: Councilor Banach

Councilor McBride stated that he had served on the Human Rights Commission with Monica and that he applauded her for being a fantastic volunteer with many fantastic ideas for the town, and said that she is going to be missed.

VOTE: Motion passes 9 – 0; Unanimous

B. Resignation: Committee on Community Safety

1. Accept Resignation of Mitch Page

MOVED by: Councilor Banach .

RESOLVED:

That the Newington Town Council hereby accepts the resignation of Mitch Page from the Committee on Community Safety in accordance with correspondence to the Town Clerk dated November 4, 2009.

SECONDED by: Councilor Nasinnyk

VOTE: Motion passes 9 – 0; Unanimous

C. Appointments to Boards and Commissions

MOTION BY Councilor Banach

RESOLVED:

That the Newington Town Council hereby makes the following appointments:

2. Affordable Housing Monitoring Agency

5 members, 5 year term
Party Max.: 4
Remaining Members: 2 Dem.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Lorraine Cariseo	51 Centerwood Lane	D	12/1/09–11/30/14	Lorraine Cariseo (Term Exp. 11/30/09)
Elector: Ellen Lyn Connery	225 Robbins Avenue	D	IMMED.-11/30/13	Sharon Braverman (de facto 11/30/08)

3. Commission on Aging and Disabled

9 members, 3 year term
Party max.: 6
Remaining Members: 2 Rep., 3 Dem., 2 Unaffiliated

Susan Mazzoccoli	149 Harris Drive	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/12	Patricia Murray (Resigned 9/3/09)
Diana B. Robino	49 Timber Lane	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/12	Lesley Hodas (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Maureen Lynch	165 Foxboro	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/12	Karen Brecher (Term exp. 11/30/09)

4. Assessment Board of Appeals

3 members, 4 year term
Party max.: 2
Remaining Members: 1 Rep.

Louis Califano	81 Woodland Street	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Louis Califano (term exp. 11/30/09)
Frederick Callahan	99 Cedarwood Lane	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Frederick Callahan

				(term exp. 11/30/09)
--	--	--	--	----------------------

6. **Building Code Board of Appeals**

5 members, 5 year term
Max from one party: 4
Remaining members: 4 Rep., 1 Dem.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Joyce Lozinski	21 Red Rock Circle	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/14	John Richter (Term exp. 11/30/09)

11. **Committee on Community Safety**

7 members (public), 4 year staggered terms
Liaisons: 2 NTC, 2 BOE, 1 Y/A Council
Remaining members (public) Rep., 2, Dem., 1, Unaf., 1

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Tammy Linteau	192 Hillcrest Avenue	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Anthony Casasanta (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Bernie Feeney	30 Rosewood Drive	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Michael Pizzuto (Term exp. 11/30/09)
David Tompkins	317 Hillcrest Avenue	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	David Tompkins (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Phyllis Dicara	29 Crown Ridge	D	IMMED. -11/30/11	Vacant

12. **Conservation Commission**

7 members, 3 alternates, 4 year term
Party Max (Reg. Members): 5
Remaining members (Newington residents): 0 Dem., 4 Rep. Remaining
Alternates: 1 Dem, 1 Rep.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Philip Block	58 Fleetwood Road	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Philip Block (Term exp. 11/30/09)
John Igielski	23 Old Musket Drive	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	John Igielski (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Phillip Shapiro	112 Barkledge Drive	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Phillip Shapiro (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Alternate: Jeffrey Zelek	55 Welles Drive N	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Jeffrey Zelek (Term exp. 11/30/09)

13. **Development Commission**

9 members, 3 alternates, 3 year term
Party Max.: 6
Remaining members: 3 Dem., 3 Rep.
Remaining Alternates: 1 Rep., 1 Dem.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
James Marocchini	75 Michael Lane	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/12	P. Joseph Harpie (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Tom Bowen	22 Woods Way	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/12	Jeffrey Hedberg (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Alternate: Kevin Chick	34 Courtland Way	D	IMMED. –11/30/10	Vacant (M. Pappa full member 10-09)

16. Employee Insurance and Pension Benefits Committee

9 members, 2 alternates, 2 year term
 Party Max.: 6
 Remaining members: 1 Rep., 1 Dem.
 Remaining Alternates: 1 Rep.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Jon Kehl	243 Reservoir Road	D	12/1/09–11/30/11	Mark Pappa (Term exp. 11/30/09)

17. Environmental Quality Commission

11 members, 2 year term
 2 NTC Liasons
 Party Max: 7
 Remaining members: 0

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Public: David Tatem	29 Camp Ave	D	12/1/09–11/30/11	Robert Briggaman (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Public: Kevin Chick	34 Cortland Drive	D	12/1/09–11/30/11	Mark Pappa (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Public: Stan Marcinczyk	91 Ivy Lane	D	12/1/09–11/30/11	Paul Vesella (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Public: Barbara Wiley	461 Robbins Avenue	D	12/1/09–11/30/11	Stephen Martocchio (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Newington Industry: Michael Fox	1901 Main Street	D	12/1/09–11/30/11	Michael Fox (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Newington Industry: Michael Camillo	126 Willard Avenue	D	12/1/09–11/30/11	Joe Mazzocchi (Term exp. 11/30/09)

18. Board of Ethics

7 members, 2 alternates, 4 year term
 Party Max. (Reg. members): 2 Rep., 2 Dem., 3 Unaf.
 Remaining members: 1 Rep., 1 Unaf., 2 Dem.
 Remaining alternates: 0.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Mary Camilli	287 Cedarwood Lane	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Mary Camilli (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Frank Marci	677 Coronado Drive	U	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Frank Marci (Term exp. 11/30/09)

19. Fair Rent Commission

5 members, 3 alternates, 2 year term
 Party Max. (Reg. members): 4
 Remaining members: 1 Rep., 0 Unaf., 0 Dem.
 Remaining alternates: 0 Rep.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Neutral Elector: John Kelly	293 Maple Hill Avenue	D	IMMED.-11/30/10	Michael Zucker (de facto 11/30/08)
Dwell. Unit Tenant:			12/1/09 – 11/30/11	Matthew Beeney (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Dwell. Unit Tenant: Audra Ekstrom	281 Faith Court	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/11	Audra Ekstrom (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Dwell. Unit Landlord: Linda Woods	82 Ivy Lane	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/11	Walter Gualtieri (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Alt Dwl. Unit Landlord: Donald Woods	82 Ivy Lane	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/11	Jeffrey Hedberg (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Alt. Neutral Elector: Michele Camerota	364 Cypress Road	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/11	Vacant (C. Woods res. 3/31/09)

23. Housing Authority

5 members, 5 year term
Party Max.: 4
Remaining Members: 3 Dem., 1 Rep.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Colleen Kornichuk	42 Broadview Road	D	12/1/09 -11/30/14	Colleen Kornichuk (Term Exp. 11/30/09)

24. Human Rights Commission

9 members, 3 year term
Party Max.: 6
Remaining members: 3 Rep., 1 Dem

			IMMED.-11/30/11	Vacant (Jeffrey Cultrera res. 1/27/09)
Louise Rickard	108 Little Brook Dr.	D	IMMED.-11/30/11	Michael Monroe (de facto 11/30/08)
Phyllis Dicara	29 Crown Ridge	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/12	Phyllis Dicara (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Theresa Claffey	420 Churchill Drive	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/12	Christine Andrews (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Barbara Wiley	461 Robbins Avenue	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/12	Val Ginn (Term exp. 11/30/09)

25. Library Board

15 members, 3 or 6 year term
Party max.: 4 (Bd. Of Directors)
Remaining Members: 1 Rep., 2 Dem.

LeeAnn Manke	112 Northwood Drive	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/11	Vacant (J. Igielski resigned 9/14/09)
Pauline Kruk	165 Walsh Avenue	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/15	Richard Jaworski (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Alan Nafis	49 Whitewood Road	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/15	Susan Wright (Term exp. 11/30/09)

28. Board of Parks and Recreation

11 members, 4 year term
Party Max.: 7
Remaining members: 6 Rep., 0 Dem,

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Kathleen Zolad	269 Candlewyck Drive	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Neal A. Forte (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Eileen Francolino	116 Lydall Road	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Eileen Francolino (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Edward Marchion	335 Stamm Road	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Jeff Perillo (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Mary Udice	26 Dalewood Road	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Mary Udice (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Donald Woods	82 Ivy Lane	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/13	Don Woods (Term exp. 11/30/09)

29. **Town Plan and Zoning Commission**

7 members, 3 Alternates, 4 year term
 Party Max.: 5
 Remaining members: 0 Dem., 4 Rep.
 Remaining alternates: 1 Dem., 0 Rep., 1 Unaf.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Michele Camerota	364 Cypress Road	D	12/1/09 –11/30/13	Thomas Ganley (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Carol Anest	30 Harding Avenue	D	12/1/09 –11/30/13	Peter Kornichuk (Term exp. 11/30/09)
David Pruett	189 Little Brook Drive	D	12/1/09 –11/30/13	David Pruett (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Alternate: Michael Carragher	38 Coolidge Avenue	D	12/1/09 –11/30/13	Michele Camerota (Term exp. 11/30/09)

31. **Standing Insurance Committee**

9 members, 2 alternates, 2 year term
 Party Max.: 6
 Remaining members: 1 Rep., 0 Dem,
 Remaining alternates: 1 Rep.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
Underwriter/Claim Spec.: Cheryl Constantine	198 Beacon Street	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/11	Christine Andrews (Term exp. 11/30/09)
Underwriter/Claim Spec.: James Zolad	269 Candlewyck Drive	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/11	James Zolad (Term exp. 11/30/09)

33. **Vehicle Appeals Board**

3 members, 2 alternates, 2 year term
 Party Max.: 2
 Remaining members: 1 Dem.
 Alternates: 1 Rep.

Name	Address	Party	Term	Replaces
John Kelly	293 Maple Hill Avenue	D	12/1/09 -11/30/11	Gil Peterson (<i>de facto</i> 11/30/07)
Alternate: Ellen Lyn Connery	225 Robbins Avenue	D	12/1/09 -11/30/11	Vacant

35. **Zoning Board of Appeals**

5 members, 3 alternates, 5 year term
 Party max.: 4
 Remaining Members: 2 Rep., 1 Dem.
 Remaining Alternates: 2 Rep. 1 Dem.

Scott Soares	120 Webster Court	D	IMMED.-11/30/13	Larry Richards (<i>de facto</i> 11/30/08)
Louis Califano	81 Woodland Street	D	12/1/09 – 11/30/14	Louis Califano (Term exp. 11/30/09)

SECONDED by: Councilor Nasinnyk

VOTE: Motion passes 9 – 0; Unanimous

VII. WRITTEN/ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE TOWN MANAGER, OTHER TOWN AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS, OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES AND OFFICIALS AND THE PUBLIC

A. Town Manager Report - none

VIII. COUNCIL LIAISON/COMMITTEE REPORTS

None

IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – IN GENERAL

- Thomas Bowen** Resident 22 Woods Way Newington
- Agrees with the Mayor concerning single-stream recycling. Likes the suggestion of using the 65 gallon barrel for trash and the larger barrel for the recycling.
 - Agrees with Councilor Klett that a subcommittee is the best approach to addressing the 2020 POD. There're many questions which need to be addressed outside the Cedar Mountain.
 - He expressed concern that the second draft, which contained so many issues, was sent to the Council.
- Judy Igielski** Resident 23 Old Musket Drive Newington
- Agrees with single-stream recycling, and the 65 gal barrel approach. In Colchester residents have to pay for the own trash pickup.
 - On the appointment listing (section 25) there is an error; terms should be for 6 years, not 2 years. The 3 year terms are the corporate members, and the 6 year terms are for those appointed. This is in the by-laws. It should read 11/30/15.
 - The TPZ term according to what appears on the appointments is a four year term; not a five year term. It reads 2014; it should be 2013
- Rose Lyons** Resident 46 Elton Drive Newington
- She requested that a call-in phone line be available explaining that once she made the trip from home to make comment, only to find the doors were locked.
- Keith Schwalenberg** Parents are residents 504New Britain Ave Newington
- Lives in CA where 65 gal recycling containers are available. There are well-used. When more space is made available, residents are motivated to use it.
 - When he returns to Newington he gets concerned because of the expansion. He sees less Newington, fewer trees. He hopes that when the guidelines are set in the plan, it should be about conservation as much as possible. While development is important, you can risk what Newington was.
- Sharon Braverman** Bd of Ed. Liaison 39 Churchill Way Newington
- Speaking as a resident, wearing her condo hat. As treasurer for Churchill Bridge Condominiums, she's very happy to hear about the single-stream recycling. She believes that the larger bin will save the Town a lot of money down the road as little will be left to discard in the trash. She applauds the Council and hopes that it will allow those in condos to get rid of their big dumpsters, and have individuals responsible.

X. REMARKS BY COUNCILORS

Councilor Boni – due to recent family developments, he regrets that he finds it necessary to resign from the Council effective December 22nd. He stated that it has been an honor and a privilege to serve on the Council for the past two years, and a pleasure to work with all the Councilors including Tom Bowen. He wished the Mayor and all Council members best wishes and success over the next two years. He also wished to thank Town Manager Salomone for his help and cooperation, as well as his Executive Assistant and the Council clerk. He wished all a merry Christmas and a healthy New Year. <applause>

Councilor Casasanta – she spoke mentioning Councilor Boni's constant hard work for the Town. She said that he and his wife Barbara were dedicated to the Town and she wished them her best.

Councilor Klett – as a former Council member who had left for personal reasons and returned, she believes that it is possible that someday Councilor Boni may return, should he feel so inclined.

Councilor McBride – He thanked Councilor Boni for his service and hopes that the Councilor will stay involved in any capacity he feels he can. Given the years he has served, he has a wealth of knowledge that will be sorely missed.

Councilor Cohen – She mentioned that she appreciated all the time and effort Councilor Boni contributed to the Charter revision. She thanked him for all his efforts and wished him well.

Councilor Nasinnyk – She mentioned that she had served on a number of committees with the Councilor and that she always appreciated his subtle, wry humor which always lightened everything. She recognized that things must have gotten difficult, and said that he would be in our thoughts and our prayers

Councilor Banach – Said that he was surprised and disappointed and that he will really miss the Councilor. Some of his fondest memories will be when they debated across the table. He stated that he felt that Councilor Boni was a worthy adversary, and he meant that in the best sense of the word. He thanked the Councilor for his service and wished him and his wife the best.

Deputy Mayor Lenares – He said that it had been a pleasure working with Councilor Boni over the past two years, and wished him good luck in the future.

Mayor Wright thanked Councilor Boni on behalf of the citizens of Newington, all of those in Town government, all elected officials, and himself. While it only was two years in time that he served on the Council, it seemed like several terms, when including the Charter revision. He has a vision of where he wanted things to go, and he should be proud because so many things he tried to accomplish, he did accomplish. The Mayor stated that he appreciated having him at his side. He wished the Councilor and his wife the best. His email will be active until his official departure date on December 22nd, tboni@newingtonct.gov. The Mayor wished Councilor Cohen and all of the Town's Jewish friends a Happy Hanukkah. He mentioned the Town's successful "Stuff-a-Cruiser" event, and reminded the public about the food bank which is still seeking donations. He also mentioned that the Deputy Mayor did a fantastic job at the tree-lighting ceremony in the center of Town.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by: Councilor Banach at 10:07 pm

SECONDED by: Councilor Klett

VOTE: The motion passed 9-0

Respectfully Submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott Coleman", written in a cursive style.

Scott Coleman
Clerk of the Council

December 15th 2009